### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 05-cv-329-GKF-PJC
	)	
TYSON FOODS, INC., et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

# STATE OF OKLAHOMA'S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT CAL-MAINE FOODS, INC.'S MOTION IN LIMINE REGARDING REFERENCE TO BENTON COUNTY FOODS, LLC AND INTEGRATED BRIEF Dkt No. [2409]

COMES NOW Plaintiff the State of Oklahoma ("State") and for its response in opposition to Cal-Maine Foods, Inc.'s ("Cal-Maine") Motion in Limine Regarding Reference to Benton County Foods, LLC ("BCF") and Integrated Brief (Dkt No. [2409]), respectfully submits that the Motion should be denied for the reasons stated herein. Cal-Maine seeks to exclude any reference to BCF at the trial of this matter, claiming that any such reference will confuse the jury and work a prejudice against Cal-Maine. Cal-Maine, without any factual reference in support thereof, complains that the State may try to "prove that the actions of [BCF] are attributable to Cal-Maine." (Cal-Maine's Motion at 3). However, reference to Cal-Maine's operation in the IRW through its wholly owned subsidiary, BCF, is appropriate and should not be limited for the reasons set forth below.

### I. DEFENDANT'S RELIANCE ON *BEST FOODS* AS DISPOSITIVE FOR VICARIOUS LIABILITY BETWEEN PARENT AND SUBSIDIARY IS MISGUIDED AND OVERLY NARROW.

In support of the proposition that it is not vicariously liable for the actions of BCF in the IRW, Cal-Maine relies solely on *United States v. Best Foods, et al.*, 524 U.S. 51 (1998). However, in that case, the Supreme Court held that a parent company may be held vicariously liable under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) 42 U.S.C.S. § 9601, et seq. The corporate veil may be pierced and the parent held liable for the subsidiary's conduct when, *inter alia*, the corporate form would otherwise be misused to accomplish certain wrongful purposes on the parent's behalf. *Id.* at 52.

There are several distinctions that differentiate the current case from Best Foods and its progeny. Foremost, the State's cause of action in this case is not confined to CERCLA. In Best Foods, the plaintiff (the United States) sued a chemical company under CERCLA for discharges of industrial waste. Accordingly, the Court's analysis was restricted to CERCLA claims only. In ultimately determining that a CERCLA claim was not viable in that particular case, the Court analyzed the term "operator" in the CERCLA statutes and determined that the defendant was not liable for the discharges by its subsidiary. In the case at bar, the State has made a CERCLA claim against Cal-Maine and other Defendants, but there are several other claims in this lawsuit as well. In grounding their entire defense on Best Foods and CERCLA, Cal-Maine has ignored vicarious liability under Oklahoma law for other claims. Further, since CERCLA is no longer at issue as the case currently stands, this point is now moot.

## II. CAL-MAINE FOODS' OWNERSHIP AND OPERATION OF BENTON COUNTY FOODS, LLC EVIDENCES "CONTROL" FOR PURPOSES OF ESTABLISHING VICARIOUS TORT LIABILITY UNDER OKLAHOMA LAW.

The relationship between Cal-Maine and BCF is more than mere parent-subsidiary. Cal-Maine created BCF in 2007 for the sole purpose of acquiring the egg production facilities of George's Inc. in the IRW. See fn. 3 infra. Additionally, Cal-Maine provides BCF with all of its chicks and many Cal-Maine executives serve in similar executive capacities for BCF. See fn. 2, 4 infra. This overlap of operations demonstrates that Cal-Maine should be held vicariously liable for the actions of BCF, its wholly owned and controlled subsidiary, under Oklahoma law.

If a subsidiary corporation is merely an instrumentality of its parent, corporate distinctions are disregarded and the parent and subsidiary are treated as one for purposes of liability. *Frazier v. Bryan Memorial Hospital Authority*, 1989 OK 73, ¶16, 775 P.2d 281, 288 (citations omitted). Under Oklahoma law, courts have generally analyzed the doctrine of "piercing the corporate veil" based on a ten (10) factor control test:

whether 1) the parent corporation owns all or most of the subsidiary's stock, 2) the corporations have common directors or officers, 3) the parent provides financing to its subsidiary, 4) the dominant corporation subscribes to all the other's stock, 5) the subordinate corporation is grossly undercapitalized, 6) the parent pays the salaries, expenses or losses of the subsidiary, 7) almost all of the subsidiary's business is with the parent or the assets of the former were conveyed to the latter, 8) the parent refers to its subsidiary as a division or department, 9) the subsidiary's officers or directors follow direction from the parent corporation, and 10) legal formalities for keeping the entities separate and independent are observed.

Frazier v. Bryan Memorial Hospital Authority, 775 P.2d 281, 288 (Okla. 1989) (citations omitted); Wallace v. Tulsa Yellow Cab Taxi & Baggage Co., 61 P.2d 645, 648 (Okla. 1936). This test is not meant to be a requirement that all ten elements be in place to

establish control, rather, that the totality of the evaluation of these elements indicates parent control over the subsidiary. *Oliver v. Farmers Insurance Group of Companies*, 941 P.2d 985 (Okla. 1997).

Applying the above-referenced facts to the case at bar, the evidence proves:

- a) that Cal-Maine originally owned 90% of the stock in BCF and now owns all of the stock of BCF<sup>1</sup>;
- b) the President and the Chief Financial Officer of Cal-Maine serve as two of three board members of BCF<sup>2</sup>;
- c) Cal-Maine created BCF to acquire George's Inc. egg production in the IRW<sup>3</sup>;
- d) Cal-Maine is the sole provider of chicks to BCF<sup>4</sup>;
- e) Cal-Maine stores and has access to all of BCF's electronic business records at its home office in Jackson, MS<sup>5</sup>;
- f) Cal-Maine's stated mission or goal is to grow through acquisition (i.e. creation of BCF and purchase of George's Inc. egg production in the IRW)<sup>6</sup>;

See Defendant, Cal-Maine Foods, Inc., Motion In Limine Regarding Reference to Benton County Foods, LLC and Integrated Brief (Dkt No. 2409) at p. 1 fn. 1 wherein Cal-Maine admits 100% ownership of Benton County Foods.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Ex. A (30(b)(6) Deposition of Cal-Maine Foods, Inc., Steve Storm testimony, ("Storm Depo"), taken October 8, 2007 at p. 225:12-16, 228:22-23). See also Cal-Maine Foods, Inc. website (Board and Management) <a href="http://phx.corporate-ir.net/phoenix.zthml?c=86814&p=irol-governance">http://phx.corporate-ir.net/phoenix.zthml?c=86814&p=irol-governance</a>. It is not known if the third board member of BCF still remains or was replaced by another Cal-Maine employee after Cal-Maine purchased the outstanding ten percent ownership interest.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> See Ex. A (Storm Depo at 96:4-21).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> See Ex. A (Storm Depo at 99:1-5).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See Ex. A (30(b)(6) Deposition of Cal-Maine Foods, Inc., Bob Gilmore testimony ("Gilmore Depo"), taken October 8, 2007 at p. 50:12-51:14).

- g) Cal-Maine and its subsidiaries, collectively the "Company" as stated in Cal-Maine's Annual Report file consolidated financial statements which specifically list BCF as a wholly owned subsidiary of Cal-Maine and part of the "Company";<sup>7</sup>
- h) Steve Storm Vice-President, Operations of Cal-Maine admittedly is responsible for supervision and oversight of BCF's egg production activities which include "care of the birds and maintenance of the physical plant."

It must be noted Cal-Maine closed its previous IRW operation in 2005-2006. Cal-Maine's re-entry into the IRW with its newly created BCF was with full knowledge of the State's pending action which includes a prayer for injunctive relief. While Cal-Maine states it contracts with others for the disposition of the poultry waste from its 800,000 birds, it does not affirmatively declare the waste is being removed from the IRW. In fact, Gabriel Timby of Terra Renewal Services ("TRS") testified that TRS daily removes waste from BCF's IRW facilities and land applies it on nearby fields. *See* Ex. A (Gabriel Timby Depo at 13).

So other than the short period of time between Cal-Maine closing one operation and opening its new BCF operation in the IRW not much is different but the name. Moreover, under Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(d)(2)(C) BCF would be bound by any injunction issued by this Court. See also Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. v. Texaco

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> See Ex. A (Storm Depo at 240:9-15).

See Ex. B (2008 Annual Report of Cal-Maine Foods, Inc. at 36 and Form 10-K for Cal-Maine Foods, Inc. filed August 11, 2009, (title page and referenced page of Annual Report and Form 10-K)).

See Defendant, Cal-Maine Foods, Inc., Motion *In Limine* Regarding Reference to Benton County Foods, LLC and Integrated Brief (Dkt No. 2409) at p. 2.

<u>Refining and Marketing, Inc.</u>, 2 F.3d 493, 506 (3rd Cir. 1993) (stating that joinder of successor in interest was unnecessary to litigation as successor would be bound by any injunction entered).

Considering the above, it is evident that reference to BCF, which is defined by Cal-Maine itself as part of the "Company," will neither confuse nor mislead the jury nor prejudice Cal-Maine in any manner. Cal-Maine's Motion must be denied in its entirety.

Respectfully Submitted,

W.A. Drew Edmondson OBA # 2628 ATTORNEY GENERAL Kelly H. Burch OBA #17067 ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL State of Oklahoma 313 N.E. 21<sup>st</sup> St. Oklahoma City, OK 73105 (405) 521-3921

#### Richard T. Garren

M. David Riggs OBA #7583
Joseph P. Lennart OBA #5371
Richard T. Garren OBA #3253
Sharon K. Weaver OBA #19010
Robert A. Nance OBA #6581
D. Sharon Gentry OBA #15641
David P. Page OBA #6852
RIGGS, ABNEY, NEAL, TURPEN,
ORBISON & LEWIS
502 West Sixth Street
Tulsa, OK 74119
(918) 587-3161

Louis W. Bullock OBA #1305 Robert M. Blakemore OBA 18656 BULLOCK, BULLOCK & BLAKEMORE 110 West Seventh Street Suite 707 Tulsa OK 74119 (918) 584-2001 Frederick C. Baker (admitted pro hac vice)
Elizabeth C. Ward (admitted pro hac vice)
Elizabeth Claire Xidis (admitted pro hac vice)
MOTLEY RICE, LLC
28 Bridgeside Boulevard
Mount Pleasant, SC 29465
(843) 216-9280

William H. Narwold (admitted pro hac vice) Ingrid L. Moll (admitted pro hac vice) MOTLEY RICE, LLC 20 Church Street, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor Hartford, CT 06103 (860) 882-1676

Jonathan D. Orent (admitted pro hac vice) Michael G. Rousseau (admitted pro hac vice) Fidelma L. Fitzpatrick (admitted pro hac vice) MOTLEY RICE, LLC 321 South Main Street Providence, RI 02940 (401) 457-7700

Attorneys for the State of Oklahoma

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this 20<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2009, I electronically transmitted the above and foregoing pleading to the Clerk of the Court using the ECF System for filing and a transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following ECF registrants:

W. A. Drew Edmondson, Attorney General	fc_docket@oag.state.ok.us
Kelly H. Burch, Assistant Attorney General	kelly_burch@oag.state.ok.us
M. David Riggs	driggs@riggsabney.com
Joseph P. Lennart	jlennart@riggsabney.com
Richard T. Garren	rgarren@riggsabney.com
Sharon K. Weaver	sweaver@riggsabney.com

Robert A. Nance	rnance@riggsabney.com		
D. Sharon Gentry	sgentry@riggsabney.com		
David P Page	dpage@riggsabney.com		
RIGGS, ABNEY, NEAL, TURPEN, ORBISON & LEWIS			
Louis Werner Bullock	lbullock@bullock-blakemore.com		
Robert M. Blakemore	bblakemore@bullock-blakemore.com		
BULLOCK, BULLOCK & BLAKEMORE			
,			
Frederick C. Baker	fbaker@motleyrice.com		
Elizabeth C. Ward	lward@motleyrice.com		
Elizabeth Claire Xidis	cxidis@motleyrice.com		
William H. Narwold	bnarwold@motleyrice.com		
Ingrid L. Moll	imoll@motleyrice.com		
Jonathan D. Orent	jorent@motleyrice.com		
Michael G. Rousseau	mrousseau@motleyrice.com		
Fidelma L. Fitzpatrick	ffitzpatrick@motleyrice.com		
MOTLEY RICE, LLC			
Counsel for State of Oklahoma			
William D. Perrine	wperrine@pmrlaw.net		
Robert P. Redemann	rredemann@pmrlaw.net		
PERRINE, MCGIVERN, REDEMANN, REID, BARRY & TAYLOR, P.L.L.C.			
David C. Senger	david@cgmlawok.com		
Robert E Sanders	rsanders@youngwilliams.com		
Edwin Stephen Williams	steve.williams@youngwilliams.com		
YOUNG WILLIAMS P.A.			
Counsel for Cal-Maine Farms, Inc and Cal-Maine Foods, Inc.			
John H. Tucker	jtucker@rhodesokla.com		
Theresa Noble Hill	thill@rhodesokla.com		
Colin Hampton Tucker	ctucker@rhodesokla.com		
Kerry R. Lewis	klewis@rhodesokla.com		
RHODES, HIERONYMUS, JONES, TUCKER & C	GABLE		
Terry Wayen West	terry@thewestlawfirm.com		
THE WEST LAW FIRM			
	111100		
Delmar R. Ehrich	dehrich@faegre.com		
Bruce Jones	bjones@faegre.com		
Krisann C. Kleibacker Lee	kklee@faegre.com		

Also on this 20<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2009 I mailed a copy of the above and foregoing pleading to

**Thomas C Green --** via email: tcgreen@sidley.com Sidley, Austin, Brown & Wood LLP

**Dustin McDaniel Justin Allen**Office of the Attorney General (Little Rock)
323 Center St, Ste 200
Little Rock, AR 72201-2610

Steven B. Randall 58185 County Rd 658 Kansas, Ok 74347

Cary Silverman -- via email: csilverman@shb.com Victor E Schwartz Shook Hardy & Bacon LLP (Washington DC)

Richard T. Garren
Richard T. Garren